REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner in discussing this application on January 29, 2008 and February 21, 2008. The discussion of the interview on February 21, 2008 is reflected in the remarks that follow.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended as supported by Fig. 3 (line C) of the specification (see also page 7, lines 18-29).

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious over Nakatani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,734,542). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 requires that in addition to a property of Tg1 > Tg2, a rate of increase in amount of thermal expansion in a thickness direction of the insulating layer at Tg2 or between Tg2 and Tg1 ("Rate A") be smaller than such rate higher than Tg1 ("Rate B"). When Rate A is smaller than Rate B as required by claim 1, large stress in the thickness direction of the insulating layer (for example, 19 of Fig. 4), i.e., tensile stress in the length direction of an inner via, (for example, 20 of Fig. 4) in the insulating layer, is less likely to be generated in both temperature ranges between Tg2 and Tg1 and higher than Tg1; because (i) when the temperature is between Tg2 and Tg1, due to small Rate A as required by claim 1 the expansion in the thickness direction of resin in the insulating layer does not increase much as the temperature rises, and accordingly, the tensile stress in the length direction of the inner via is not likely generated; and (ii) when the temperature is at or higher than Tg1, the resin in the insulating layer, whose temperature has attained its glass transition temperature Tg1 and which has been softened, can expand in the plane direction because resin in the circuit substrates, which hold the insulating layer between them and whose glass transition temperature Tg2 has been attained, has already been softened (see page 6, lines 3-11 and 20-23; page 7, lines 29-37; page 8, lines 5-11; and Fig. 3), and thus, the tensile stress in the length direction of the inner via is avoided. In contrast, if Rate A were larger than Rate B, i.e., the expansion of the insulating layer in its thickness direction would rapidly increase as the temperature rose, the tensile stress on the inner via formed in the insulating layer and connected to the circuit substances would be generated because the

temperature has not reached the glass transition temperature of the resin in the insulating layer Tg1 and the resin in the insulating layer has not been softened (see page 5, lines 35-36, and Fig. 2). Such tensile stress on the inner via may deteriorate the connection between the inner via and the circuit substrates (page 7, lines 13-17). The reference, however, does not disclose or suggest the selection of materials satisfying the Rate A and Rate B relationship discussed above. Accordingly, claim 1 is distinguished from the reference.

Claim 9 is distinguished from the reference for at least the same reason as discussed above.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-17 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Hamre, Schumann,
Mueller & Larson, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-455-3800

Date: March 5, 2008

By _____
Name: Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300